

## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1-53 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 32 and 42 have been amended. No claims have been added. No claims have been canceled.

The Examiner has indicated Claims 11-20 and 43-53 are in condition for allowance. Applicant thanks the Examiner for providing such an indication. The remaining comments are directed to the remaining claims.

Claims 1, 32 and 42 have been amended to fix grammatical errors in the claims. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added and respectfully requests the Examiner enter the amendments.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 6-10, 21-23, 25-34, and 37-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over “User Interface Markup Language (UIML) Draft Specification Document Version 17”, Harmonia, Inc. in view of Templeman (U.S. 5,845,303).

Claim 1 as amended is as follows:

A method of dynamically adapting a presentation generated by an application to a display screen of any of a plurality of heterogeneous device platforms, the method comprising:

- a) providing a plurality of graphical user interface components in a hierarchical configuration, the graphical user interface components being platform independent with respect to the plurality of heterogeneous device platforms;
- b) arranging the graphical user interface components on a page as a function of the hierarchy; and
- c) creating a device platform dependent presentation by selectively transforming one or more of the graphical user interface components to adjust the size of the page to be closer to the maximum fill of a display screen of one of the heterogeneous device platforms running the application than if filled without transformation. (emphasis added)

As set forth above, Claim 1 of the present invention as claimed sets forth dynamically adapting a presentation in which a set of platform independent graphical user interface components are used to create a device platform dependent presentation by selectively

transforming at least one graphical user interface component to adjust the size of the page to be closer to the maximum fill of a display screen of one of the heterogeneous device platforms running the application.

Neither Harmonia nor Templeman disclose the features discussed above with respect to Claim 1. As admitted by the Examiner, Harmonia does not disclose selectively transforming at least one graphical user interface component to adjust the size of the page to be closer to the maximum fill of a display screen of one of the heterogeneous device platforms running the application. Therefore, Harmonia does not disclose creating a device platform dependent presentation by selectively transforming at least one graphical user interface component to adjust the size of the page to be closer to the maximum fill of a display screen of one of the heterogeneous device platforms running the application.

The Examiner believes that Templeman discloses creating a device platform dependent presentation by selectively transforming at least one graphical user interface component to adjust the size of the page to be closer to the maximum fill of a display screen of one of the heterogeneous device platforms running the application. Applicant respectfully submits that Templeman does not disclose such a teaching.

First, Templeman discloses generating a display of data using metaforms. Metaforms are layouts or forms that have defined formats, including a number of frames into which specific types of data may be input. A frame is a dynamic template defined to receive specific items of information. Specifically, each of the frames is defined to receive either text or graphics data. Examples of graphics data given in Templeman include the letterhead or logo of a newspaper.

Although the user may select the set of data to be used with a specific metaform, the user does not dynamically interact with the metaform when the data is being input into the form. Thus, although one or more frames may be defined to receive graphics data, the frames are not

graphical user interface (GUI) components. Thus, the metaform cannot operate as a user interface. In view of this, Applicant respectfully submits that Templeman does not disclose adjusting or transforming the size of GUI component.

Furthermore, even for the sake of arguendo, even if the transformation of a frame of a metaform is considered adjusting the size of a GUI component, there is no discussion of transforming the size of a frame, and in turn the metaform, to make the size of the page closer to the maximum fill of a display screen. The Examiner points to column 5, lines 27-29 where it states that metaforms may be customized for use with particular display types and sizes to optimally utilize available screen space. At column 11, lines 50-54, Templeman reiterates this when it states:

“Further, specific metaforms may be developed for particular screen and display types to effectively utilize available space and size. Thus, a system [] may include a variety of metaforms.”

It is clear from these statements that to make use of available space and size, Templeman’s solution was to create different metaforms for particular screen and display types. There is no discussion in Templeman that this occurs dynamically. That is, there is no discussion in Templeman to have the metaform transformed to make it closer to the maximum fill of a display screen upon which it is being displayed. In fact, Templeman explicitly says it’s the amount of data that determines the displayed image. For example, at column 11, lines 20-22, as Templeman is discussing the general operation of his technique (in conjunction with Figure 5 beginning on column 10), it states “[t]hus, the actual image displayed on the displayed device 44 depends upon the nature and the amount of data input into each frame.” Thus, Applicant submits that that Templeman does not disclose modifying one or more GUI components to adjust the size of a page to be closer to the maximum fill of a display screen.

Moreover, the language in Claim 1 requires that the transformation of one or more GUI components be selective so as to adjust the size of the page to be closer to the maximum fill of the display system. In other words, there must be a selection from among the GUI components for the purpose of adjusting the size of the page to be closer to the maximum fill of the display system. Templeman does not show any such selectivity. Because Templeman only discloses that the displayed image is determined by the amount of data, there is no selectivity in adjusting the size of the display to be closer to the maximum fill of the display system. The size of the display only changes if data for one or more of the frames changes in size, which only occurs due to changes in the size of the data. The data may cause the display to be less than or greater than the size of the display. Without any selectivity in transforming GUI components, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Harmonia and Templeman does not teach all of the limitations of the claim and therefore, cannot render Claim 1 obvious.

The same limitations discussed above are included in the other independent claims, namely Claims 32 and 42. Therefore, for the same reasons, the present invention as claimed in Claims 32 and 42, as well as the claims that depend, directly or indirectly, on Claims 1, 32 and 42, are not obvious in view of the combination of Harmonia and Templeman.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome by the amendments and the remarks. Applicant submits that claims 1-3, 6-10, 21-23, 25-34, and 37-42 as amended are now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections to the claims have been overcome by the amendments and the remarks and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested. Applicants submit that Claims 1-53 as amended are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 8-15, 2006



Thomas S. Ferrill  
Registration No. 42,532

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8598